Remarks

Claims 1-11 were pending in the application and were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 9 and 11 have been amended and new claims 12-20 have been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7, 10-11 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,221,332 issued to Thumm et al. (hereinafter "Thumm '332"). Applicants have amended claim 1 to more distinctly claim the present invention. Amended claim 1 recites "a flexible conduit fluidly connected between the metering ram and the flow meter" and "a mixing chamber that receives the at least two components under pressure, the mixing chamber being disposed proximate a robot." Thumm '332 does not recite a flexible conduit fluidly connected between a metering ram and a flow meter or a mixing chamber disposed proximate a robot. Instead, Thumm '332 discloses "piping 108" for providing source material A and source material B (column 5, lines 33-35). Moreover, Thumm '332 emphasizes that each of the source materials are provided at "a pressure in the range of about 8,000 to 50,000 psi and even greater" (column 4, lines 38-41) further indicating that rigid, inflexible piping must be provided with the mixer/reactor of Thumm '332. In addition, Thumm '332 does not disclose or remotely suggest a mixing chamber attached to a robot. Indeed, the term "robot" is not found anywhere in Thumm '332. Consequently, Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome. Since claims 3, 7, and 10-11 depend on claim 1, Applicants believe these claims are allowable for the same reasons.

In addition, a *prima facie* case has not been established for the rejection of claim 11. Claim 11 recites that "a first pressure transducer is located between the first flow meter and the nozzle and a second pressure transducer is located between the second flow meter and the nozzle." Thumm '332 does not disclose any sensor, let alone a transducer, disposed between first or second flow meters and a nozzle. Indeed, only a priming valve 178,178', shutoff valve 180,180', and a check valve 182,182', are disposed between the flowmeters

106,106' and discharge means 121 (see Figure 4). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-9 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thumm '332. Claims 4-9 depend on amended claim 1. As a result, Applicants believe these claims are allowable for the reasons previously discussed. Moreover, a *prima facie* case has not been established for the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Claim 4 recites that "a shutoff valve is located between a supply and the metering ram." Thumm '332 does not recite a shutoff valve located between a supply and the metering ram. Instead, Thumm '332 discloses check valves 166,166' disposed downstream of material pistons 160,160' (see Figure 4). The check valves are not shutoff valves since check valves only inhibit flow in one direction while indiscriminately permitting flow in the opposite direction. Indeed, the check valves 166,166' merely "prevent high pressure blowing of source materials A and B out of the source reservoirs 166 and 162'" (column 7, lines 42-44). As such, a *prima facie* case has not been established and this rejection must be withdrawn.

Claim 5 recites that "a first shutoff valve is located between a catalyst supply and the metering ram and a second shutoff valve is located between a base supply and the metering ram." Thumm '332 does not recite first and second shutoff valves located between a catalyst and base supplies and a metering ram. Instead, Thumm '332 discloses check valves 166,166' disposed downstream of material pistons 160,160' (see Figure 4). The check valves are not shutoff valves since check valves only inhibit flow in one direction while indiscriminately permitting flow in the opposite direction. Indeed, the check valves 166,166' merely "prevent high pressure blowing of source materials A and B out of the source reservoirs 166 and 162'" (column 7, lines 42-44). As such, a *prima facie* case has not been established and this rejection must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD JOHN SZYMANSKI

By _____
Matthew M. Mietzel
Reg. No. 46,929
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 15, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351